

App. No. 09/826,733
Art Unit: 2143

Docket No. 3599.PALM

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-10 and 27-40 are pending, claims 1-8 and 10 are amended, claims 11-26 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 27-40 are added. The specification is amended to correct typographical errors.

Rejection of Claims 1-26

On page 2 of the Final Office Action of April 8, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,785 to Craig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,873 to Carim et al. ("Carim"). Applicant submits that the amended claims obviate the rejection.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a communication system. The communication system includes, among other things, a first client device for performing data processing functions. The first client device is for establishing a communication link with the server, for receiving a copy of the client software from the server in response to the communication link being established, and for using said client software to perform the data synchronization with the server to obtain a portion of the information, wherein as a result of performing the data synchronization, the portion of the information on the first client device and in the database of the server are up-to-date.

Craig discloses a system for providing synchronized presentation of slides over a computer network (see Abstract). Craig does not disclose or suggest that a first client device is for establishing a communication link with the server, for receiving a copy of the client software from the server in response to the communication link being established, and for using the copy

App. No. 09/826,733
Art Unit: 2143

Docket No. 3599.PALM

of the client software to perform the data synchronization with the server to obtain a portion of the information, wherein as a result of performing the data synchronization, the portion of the information on the first client device and in the database of the server are up-to-date.

Assuming arguendo that Craig discloses a client device receiving a copy of client software (an applet) and using the copy of the client software to perform a synchronization with a server to obtain a portion of information, as alleged by the Examiner on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, Craig does not disclose or suggest using the copy of the client software to perform a data synchronization with the server to obtain a portion of the information, wherein as a result of performing the data synchronization, the portion of the information on the first client device and in the database of the server are up-to-date, as required by claim 1.

Carini fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Craig. Therefore, Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Craig in view of Carini and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Craig in view of Carini for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-10 be withdrawn.

Claims 11-26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby making the rejection moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11-26 be withdrawn.

New Claims 27-40

New claim 27 is directed to a method that includes, among other things, receiving a copy of client software at a second device from a first device in response to a communication link being established and using the copy of the client software at the second device to perform data

App. No. 09/826,733
Art Unit: 2143

Docket No. 3599.PALM

synchronization with the first device to obtain a portion of information, wherein as a result of performing the data synchronization, the portion of the information on the second device and in the database of the first device are up-to-date. Applicant submits that claim 27 is similar to claim 1 and is patentable for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1.

Claims 28-33 depend from claim 27 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 27.

New claims 34-40 are medium claims that correspond to claims 27-33. Applicant submits that claims 34-40 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 27-33.

App. No. 09/826,733
Art Unit: 2143

Docket No. 3599.PALM

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2005

By: 

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 49632

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433